Writing Rationales
November 2014 Training

Feedback from June Webinar Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citations &amp; Writing Rationales</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Self-Study Reports</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of MAERB Policies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Coordinator Responsibilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring New Team Coordinators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals of Presentation

* General reminders and updates
* Focus on writing rationales
* Combine it with a brief discussion about citations
MAERB Updates—Tentative Standards Timeline

• Proposed Standards currently on review at CAAHEP
• Anticipate an open hearing in January 2015
• Formal Approval by March 2015
• Site Visits conducted under the new Standards in 2017

MAERB UPDATES

• New Resources:
  • The Program Director’s Handbook was revised and is available on the website.
  • New Site Visit Documentation Checklist
  • New Self-Study Dividers, Explanation
  • Outcomes Thresholds Chart

MAERB Updates: New Resources for Surveyors

• Surveyor To Do List
On-line Peer Evaluation Form

* Survey Monkey link on the Surveyor To Do List
* You will receive a reminder after the visit to fill out the form for your fellow reviewer
* This form also has a space for you to make suggestions to the Accreditation staff as well
* Programs will also receive a link to fill out a form

Thank You—Pet Peeves

* You provided information about “issues” that you discovered at site visits
  * Used at the most recent Accreditation Workshop
  * Provided you with a copy of the PowerPoint

New Process: OSSR Review

* OSSR is reviewed by MAERB Office: Sarah Marino or Jim Hardman
* Team Coordinator is sent a Review Form: comments, questions, edits
* Team Coordinator responds to questions and modifications
* OSSR is then modified
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OSSR Review Process

Rationale Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAERB Office</td>
<td>Clarity &amp; Consistency with Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Explanation/Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAERB Liaison</td>
<td>Standards/Requested documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAERB Members</td>
<td>Standards/Policy/Uniformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAHEP Recommendation</td>
<td>Consistency/Uniformity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals of New Process

- Provide surveyors with some immediate feedback
- Provide programs with an edited version of the OSSR (typically occurred at a later stage)
- Build more programmatic knowledge in the MAERB office in order to provide the Program Directors with more support
- Provide the MAERB Liaisons a more focused report
Summary of Rationale Purposes

• Provide direction to the programs
• Provide connections with the Standards
• Provide guidelines for the requested documentation
• Provide substantiation for a number of audience

Basic Rationale “Don’ts”

• Do not use the first person
• Do not use proper names
• Avoid qualifications: appears, seems, might be
• Do not use a “notes” format

Basic Rationale “Do’s”

• Write in complete grammatical sentences
• Provide details about information source
• Be specific, yet as concise as possible
  • Err on the side of specifics rather than conciseness
Avoid Incomplete Sentences & Note Style
Do not use the items below

• No educational theory and techniques
• CAAHEP address incorrect
• PD does not provide information to AC.

Standard II.A

• Citation: Public Member
• Original Rationale: There is no public member on the Advisory Committee.

Improved Rationale

• The Advisory Committee rosters for the last two years had no public member representative listed, and the Program Director verified that there was no public member currently on the Advisory Committee.
Standard III: Program Resources

• Language from Standard:
  • Program resources must be sufficient to ensure the achievement of the program’s goals and outcomes

Citations in III.A

• Need to demonstrate that the resources are not sufficient.
• Program Directors/Deans often ask to be cited in order to get funding

Standard III.A—Removed Citations

• **Citation**: clerical staff
• **Rationale** (inadequate): The program has only part-time clerical staff.
• **Citation**: Program Director
• **Rationale** (inadequate): The Program Director has teaching responsibilities as well as administrative responsibilities.
Standard III.B

- **Citation:** Program Director, administration of the Program
- **Rationale** (supported): The program director is also the practicum coordinator with teaching responsibilities. There are over 250 students in the program. As the sole full-time program staff, she does not have adequate time to maintain program effectiveness and outcomes. This is evidenced by the failure to incorporate many of the required psychomotor and affective competencies into the curriculum and by the lack of implementation and documentation of graduate and employer surveys.

---

Standard III.B.2.b Faculty Qualifications

- **Citation:** prepared in educational theory and techniques
- **Rationale** (inadequate): Faculty do not have documented background in educational theory or techniques.

---

Conundrum: No Names

- Adjunct faculty do not have documented background in educational theory or techniques.
- Full-time faculty do not have documented background in educational theory or techniques.
- Faculty member who teaches pharmacology does not have documented background in educational theory or techniques.
Standard IV.B.1 Outcomes

- Change in Credentialing Exam
- Participation: 30% of all graduates for that particular year
- Passage rate: 60% of all the exam-takers
- Data Monitoring Approach
- Definition of the “Trigger Course”
- Retention of raw data for five years reported on the most recent ARF

Major Change

You would not cite the program

- If the program has not met the thresholds

Citation Information for Surveyors, CA Visits

You would cite within the outcomes section for the following reasons:

- If the program is not using the questions, Likert scale, and domain separations for the graduate and employer surveys
  NOTE: MAERB provides templates, but they can be varied as long as those key elements are included.
- If the raw data does not match or support the summative data on the ARF
- If the "trigger" does not conform to the definition that is used in either the past or the newly updated definition
- If the program is not measuring a given outcome (not sending out surveys, not keeping data)
Raw Data for Annual Report forms

• MAERB relies upon you to check the raw data
  • Remind the PD that you need it organized by admission cohort date
  • If the raw data does not match with the numbers within a specific threshold, it is a citation
  • If there is a discrepancy, ask the Program Director
  • Include the Program Director’s explanation in your rationale if there is a discrepancy in the data and you cite the program in that outcome due to that discrepancy
  • Specify the year and the outcome

Standard IV.B.1

Citations: Retention, Positive Job Placement, Graduate Satisfaction Survey, Employer Satisfaction Survey

NOTE: Credentialing exam results would not be cited

Good Rationale: The data for the 2012 admissions cohort was incomplete and did not accurately reflect the numbers found on the ARF for the Employer Satisfaction Survey. There was no raw data available for any of the previous years for any of the outcomes. The current Program Director, who has been in the position for approximately 18 months, did not find any raw data for the previous years.

Standard IV.B.1

Citations: graduate satisfaction survey, employer satisfaction survey

Good Rationale: The program had raw data for the graduate satisfaction surveys for 2011, 2012, and 2013; however, there was no raw data for the 2010 and 2009 admission cohorts.

The program had raw data for the employer satisfaction surveys for 2010, 2012, and 2013; however, there was no raw data for the 2011 and 2009 admission cohorts.

The Program Director explained that she was not able to find the surveys conducted under the direction of the previous Program Director.
Standard V.A.1: When to cite?

- Inaccurate information about the program
- Wrong number of credit hours
- Inaccurate listing of practicum hours
- Identity of CAAHEP-Accredited program is misrepresented

- As a formal announcement, the program’s letter to the practicum sites incorrectly states that the program follows standards set by AAMA rather than by CAAHEP or MAERB.
- The 2011-2013 college catalog (pp.60 & 62) states that "medical assisting programs are accredited by CAAHEP"; however, only the diploma program is accredited. Students thought that both programs were accredited.
Standard V.A.2

Citation: Programmatic accreditation (students and applicants)

Sample Rationale: On the website and in the college catalog, the information about the program's accreditation status is incomplete, as the CAAHEP address is not listed.

Sample Rationale: The 2014-2015 College Catalog does not have the correct required accreditation statement for the Diploma program stating only, "The Medical Assisting Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP)." The wording of the accreditation statement is incorrect in the Medical Assisting Handbook (p. 6) as it misidentifies MAERB as CRB.
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Standard Citation Errors

- Double Dinging
- Confusion between Standard V.A.1 & V.A.2
- Citing one of the objectives or competencies as “Not Taught” and then indicating that “Achievement was measured.”
- Marking all of the objectives and/or competencies and not checking them
- Not providing a rationale for a citation
- Providing a rationale without a citation
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Closing Comments: Future Projects

- Surveyor Handbook: late spring
- Updated OSSR: Sometime
- Evaluation Report for Surveyors: March/April
Thank you!!!